

Appln. No. 10/782,099
Amendment dated October 27, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 27, 2005

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 6 remain in this application. No claims have been cancelled, withdrawn, or added.

Paragraphs 1 through 4 of the Office Action

Claims 1, 2, and 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Donohoo.

Claims 3, 5, and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Donahoo in view of Narayanaswami.

Claims 1 and 6 as amended each require "wherein said display member displays time calculated by said processing assembly, said display member simultaneously displaying time in hours and minutes and in hours and hundredths of an hour". This feature, clearly shown in Figure 1 of the drawings, permit the wearer to simultaneously view the current time in both claimed forms, so that the user does not have to continually switch between settings to determine the time in both forms.

In marked contrast to the claimed invention, the Donahoo patent discusses the display of time in this manner (as referenced in the rejection of the Office Action) at col. 2, lines 65 through 68 (emphasis added):

Display mode switch 16 permits selection of either of two display formats, whereby a time interval is displayed in either hours and minutes or hours and hundreds of an hours.

Clearly, the Donahoo patent leads one of ordinary skill in the art to the belief that one or the other time formats should be displayed, but not both. It is therefore submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be led to the claimed invention by Donahoo, which clearly leads one away from

Appln. No. 10/782,099
Amendment dated October 27, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 27, 2005

the requirements of the claim, and essentially teaches against the requirements of claims 1 and 6.

Further, claims 1 and 6 each require "a housing assembly having a size making capable of being worn by the user on an arm of the user". It is asserted in the rejection that Donahoo motivates the making smaller of the Donahoo apparatus, but clearly the functions contemplated and required to be performed by the apparatus disclosed by Donahoo would not lead one of ordinary skill in the art to believe that this apparatus could be put in the form of a housing wearable on the wrist of a user.

It is therefore submitted that the cited patents, and especially the allegedly obvious combination of Donahoo and Narayanaswami set forth in the rejection of the Office Action, would not lead one skilled in the art to the applicant's invention as required by claim 1 and 6. Further, claims 2 through 5, which depend from claim 1, also include the requirements discussed above and therefore are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the §102(b) and §103(a) rejections of claims 1 through 6 is therefore respectfully requested.

Appln. No. 10/782,099
Amendment dated October 27, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed July 27, 2005

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.



Date: Oct. 27, 2005

Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)
Customer No. **40,158**
P.O. Box 5027
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357